



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,109	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	17200-602	9251

54205 7590 03/08/2006
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 ROCKEFELER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KANG, INSUN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/708,109	NEDDERMAN, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Insun Kang	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 12/6/2005.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 1-92 have been amended. Claims 1-104 are pending in the application.

Specification

3. The use of the trademark JAVA (i.e. specification page 11), UNIX (i.e. specification page 2) and ACTIVEX (i.e. specification page 11) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

*Note: the applicant needs to capitalize the trademarks above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US Patent 6,535,883) herein after referred to as "Lee."

Per claim 1:

Lee discloses:

-receiving information over a communications network ("server computer...confirming data input by a user of the mobile computer," col. 4 lines 5-25)

retrieving customizable validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and

determining computer data validity by applying the retrieved validation rules to the information ("In order to ensure the validity of the data entered by the worker, some or all of the fields will have an associated validation rule... for performing one or more tests or comparisons on data in one or more fields to make sure the data is valid...The validation rules are loaded ...and validation rules associated with fields in the rules file are associated ...with the corresponding field names in the MPA. The validation rules test the contents of each field entered by the user to ensure that the field is filled out correctly," col. 2 lines 24-40) as claimed .

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses highlighting information determined to be invalid by the validation rules (see Fig 14) as claimed.

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are

Art Unit: 2193

translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 7-12, they are the system versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 13-18, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 19-24, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claim 25:

Lee discloses identifying data types requiring validation and providing customizable validation rules stored in a memory device for the associated data types from a rules library ("Sets of validation rules are created for a form interactively, by selecting fields, adding appropriate validation rules to be implemented for the fields, and adding appropriate expressions for the validation rules," col. 3 lines 19-40) as claimed.

Per claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a

Art Unit: 2193

rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 30-34, they are the system versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 35-39, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 40-44, they are the apparatus versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claim 45

Lee discloses:

- providing a rules library and an initial parent rule stored in a memory device (The menu presents the expressions as expression templates, which are templates for creating and completing an expression," col. 3 lines 40-54)
- building customizable validation rules by subclassing members of a rules library class hierarchy ("allows a user to create a validation rule by selecting a template and fill in the blacks," col. 3 lines 50-54) as claimed.

Per claim 46:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing subclassed validation rules in the rule library ("enables a user to create a set of form validation

Art Unit: 2193

rules...Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file," col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the subclassed validation rules inherit validation logic from a parent rule (col. 6 lines 54-67) as claimed.

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are associated with data types (Table 2, col. 11 lines 31-60) as claimed.

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("receiving data including the input data from the form submitted to a server," col. 2 lines 33-40) ("it is determined whether the input data is valid using information stored in the registry," col. 2 lines 33-44)

Per claim 50:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Art Unit: 2193

Per claims 51-56, they are the system versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 57-62, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 63-68, they are the apparatus versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claim 69:

Lee discloses:

-marking data types for associated customizable validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and providing validation marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 70:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses:

- building forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 71:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 72:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses providing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types over a communications network (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 73:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 74:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claims 75-80, they are the system versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 81-86, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 87-92, they are the apparatus versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Art Unit: 2193

6. Claims 93-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nugent ("Addressing For Field Validation with regular Expressions and JavaScript 1.2," 11/1997).

Per claim 93:

Nugent discloses:

-identifying browser capability, choosing a validation deployment; determining if a browser supports regular expressions, and if so, providing validation rules to a client determining if the browser supports non regular expression language, and if so, providing non regular expression language information validation; determining if the browser does not support non regular expression language, and if not, providing regex enabled validation on a server ; providing the browser with appropriate network location and the validation rules; obtaining information from a user; validating information with appropriate validation rules stored in a memory device (JavaScript 1.2 supports regular expression and provides common object detection routines such as window.RegExp that detects the browser compatibility).

Per claim 94:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Nugent discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page (JavaScript 1.2) as claimed.

Per claim 95:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Nugent discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (JavaScript 1.2) as claimed.

Per claims 96-98, they are the system versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 99-101, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 102-104, they are the apparatus versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/6/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Per claims 1-92:

The Applicant states that a template in the cited prior art is different from the customizable validation rules library as the "template may not be subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent as may be achieved with the claimed customizable rules."

The claims do not recite "subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent." Further, Lee discloses the rules file stores the validation rules are stored in the rules files and the tree structure can be updated to reflect validation level and override mode of the new rule to be defined (col. 4 lines 27-41 and Fig 5A).

Art Unit: 2193

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 93-104 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

I. Kang
Examiner



KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2103